SINGLE BENCH

(2)

C.S.-1001 (4)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR**

**CHHATTISGARH**

**W.P.(S) No. 841 /2007**

**PETITIONER** : Smt. Rewati Bai,
W/O. Sanjay Kumar Kewat,
aged about : 31 years,
R/O. Village : Rampur,
Tahsil : Kartala,
Distt. : Korba (C.G.)

P.R. No. 1031/07
Presented by Shri C.P. Lahiri
Date 6/12/07

**VERSUS**

**RESPONDENTS**

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through : The Secretary,
Mahila Avam Bal Vikas
Mantralaya,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur
Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
6/12/07
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2. The Collector,
Korba, Distt. Korba (C.G.)

APARNA MALVIYA
CG-2073/96
6/12/07
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Janpad Panchayat Kartala,
Distt. Korba (C.G.)

4. The Project Officer,
Ekikrit Bal Vikas
Pariyojna, Kartala,
Distt. Korba (C.G.)

5. Smt. Sharda Bai,
W/O. Jawahar Lal,
Aged about : 30 years,
R/O. Village : Rampur,
Tahsil : Kartala,
Distt. Korba (C.G.)

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF**

**THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

The petitioner humbl

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 841 of 2007

Petitioner Smt. Rewati Bai

Versus

Respondents State of Chhattisgarh & others

**Single Bench:** Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

---

Present: Mr. P.K. Patel, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate for the State.

---

**ORDER**

**(Passed on 13th Day of February, 2007)**

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the appointment of respondent No. 5 is contrary to Aanganbadi Scheme, as respondent No. 5 is not living below the poverty line. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is living below the poverty line (BPL), as such the petitioner has preferential claim over respondent No. 5 for appointment as Aanganbadi Karyakarta/Sahayika.

2. Be that as it may, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the Collector Korba/respondent No. 2 is directed to look into the allegation made by the petitioner and pass appropriate order in accordance with Aanganbadi Scheme and law.

3. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash